UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/705,181	11/10/2003	Ian D. Hegerty	5598/154US	4662

7590 06/07/2006

Seth Ostrow
Brown Raysman Millstein Felder and Steiner LLP
900 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022-4728

EXAMINER	
SERRAO, RANODHI N	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/705,181	HEGERTY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ranodhi Serrao	2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 April 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *2-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *2-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 27 April 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argued in substance the amendments of claims 2-23 and the newly added claim 24. However, upon review and consideration, the cited prior art references teach all limitations as claimed.

2. The applicant argued that Wilson and/or Schuetze fail to teach, "analyzing one or more inlinks to at least one global host from the set of global host to determine a countrytag for the at least one global host." However the combination of Wilson and Schuetze does teach the limitation as claimed as shown in the below rejections.

3. The applicant also argued that Wilson does not teach or suggest a method for distinguishing between websites having a "global host" and a particular "country host." This argument is not convincing since, in ¶ 11 Wilson states, "Some of the top level domains such as .com, .net, and .org are for the general public usage..." These refer to global hosts and in ¶ 60-69 Wilson describes different countries with different country hosts. Therefore Wilson teaches the invention as claimed.

4. The applicant furthermore argued that Wilson fails to teach or suggest "assigning a countrytag to a global host of the web site." However, in ¶ 31 Wilson states, "Examples of domains created under this system are shop.us.com, help.us.com, shop.jp.com, and go.jp.com. These domains represent the United States and Japan." Therefore Wilson does assign a countrytag to .com web sites which refers to global hosts as stated in the applicant's disclosure.

5. The examiner points out that the pending claims must be "given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification" [In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541 (CCPA 1969)] and "consistent with the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach" [In re Cortright, 49 USPQ2d 1464 (Fed. Cir. 1999)]. In conclusion, upon taking the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims, the cited references teach all of the claimed limitations. And the rejections are reaffirmed. See below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

7. Claims 2-5, 20-21, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson et al. (2005/0114484) and Schuetze et al. (6,941,321).

8. As per claim 24, Wilson et al. teaches a method of determining a countrytag for a website on a network (see Wilson et al., page 7, claim 1), comprising: identifying a set of country hosts for a plurality of websites, each country host having a country-related domain (see Wilson et al., ¶ 65-70); assigning a countrytag to each country host that corresponds to the country-related domain for the respective country host (see Wilson et al., ¶ 60-64); identifying a set of global hosts for a plurality of websites, each global host not having a country-related domain (see Wilson et al., ¶ 11); at least one global host from the set of global host to determine a countrytag for the at least one global host (see Wilson et al., ¶ 31); and producing an augmented set of hosts that includes the set of country hosts, the at least one global host, and the corresponding countrytags for

each country host and the at least one global host (see Wilson et al., ¶ 33). But fails to teach analyzing one or more inlinks. However, Schuetze et al. teaches analyzing one or more inlinks (see Schuetze et al., col. 2, lines 43-56). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wilson et al. to analyzing one or more inlinks in order to advantageously employ a framework to enhance browsing, searching, retrieving and recommending content in a collection of documents (see Schuetze et al., col. 5, lines 43-47).

9. As per claim 2, Wilson et al. and Schuetze et al. teach a method, wherein the country-related domain is a top-level domain (see Wilson et al., ¶ 24).

10. As per claim 3, Wilson et al. and Schuetze et al. teach a method, further comprising: crawling the network to gather information about the pages or sites in the network, including the top-level domain and connectivity of the crawled sites (see Wilson et al., ¶ 39: wherein searching serves the function of crawling).

11. As per claim 4, Wilson et al. and Schuetze et al. teach a method, wherein the network is the Internet (see Wilson et al., ¶ 27).

12. As per claim 5, Wilson et al. and Schuetze et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claim 24 above, but Wilson et al. fails to teach a method, wherein the network is an intranet. However, Schuetze et al. teaches a method, wherein the network is an intranet (see Schuetze et al., col. 10, lines 9-18). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wilson et al. to a method, wherein the network is an intranet to serve a company's internal purposes (see Schuetze et al., col. 1, lines 35-40).

13. As per claim 6, Wilson et al. and Schuetze et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claim 24 above, and furthermore Wilson et al. teaches a method wherein said analyzing comprises at least on country host from the set of country hosts (see Wilson et al., ¶ 60-70). But fails to teach analyzing one or more inlinks. However, Schuetze et al. teaches analyzing one or more inlinks (see Schuetze et al., col. 2, lines 43-56). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wilson et al. to analyzing one or more inlinks in order to advantageously employ a framework to enhance browsing, searching, retrieving and recommending content in a collection of documents (see Schuetze et al., col. 5, lines 43-47).

14. As per claim 20, Wilson et al. and Schuetze et al. teach a method, wherein a different test is used to determine if a website should be assigned a "US" countrytag than is used for assigning countrytags of non-US countries (see Wilson et al., ¶ 9).

15. As per claim 21, Wilson et al. and Schuetze et al. teach a method, wherein a website can be assigned more than one countrytag (see Wilson et al., ¶ 82).

16. Claims 7-9, 11, 13, and 16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson et al. and Schuetze et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Pitkow et al. (2002/0016786).

17. As per claim 7, Wilson et al. and Schuetze et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claim 24 above but fail to teach a method of analyzing inlinks to and outlinks from the at least one global host. However, Pitkow et al. teaches a method of analyzing inlinks to

and outlinks from the at least one global host (see Pitkow et al., ¶ 20). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wilson et al. and Schuetze et al. to a method of analyzing inlinks to and outlinks from the at least one global host in order to build up a relevance profile for each individual and/or group and map that profile in accordance with a determined relevance model to collection content (see Pitkow et al., ¶ 120).

18. As per claim 8, Wilson et al. and Schuetze et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claim 24 above but fail to teach a method, wherein said analyzing comprises: assigning a countrytag to a global host when all of the following are true: there are more unique inlinking hosts from country code top-level domains than from global domains, there are more than a predetermined number of unique inlinking hosts from country code top-level domains, and there are more than a predetermined percentage of unique inlinking hosts from the same country code top-level domain. However, Pitkow et al. teaches a method, wherein said analyzing comprises: assigning a countrytag to a global host when all of the following are true (see Pitkow et al., ¶ 107): there are more unique inlinking hosts from country code top-level domains than from global domains (see Pitkow et al., ¶ 113), there are more than a predetermined number of unique inlinking hosts from country code top-level domains (see Pitkow et al., ¶ 118), and there are more than a predetermined percentage of unique inlinking hosts from the same country code top-level domain (see Pitkow et al., ¶ 55). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wilson et al. and Schuetze et al. to a method, wherein said analyzing comprises: assigning a countrytag

to a global host when all of the following are true: there are more unique inlinking hosts from country code top-level domains than from global domains, there are more than a predetermined number of unique inlinking hosts from country code top-level domains, and there are more than a predetermined percentage of unique inlinking hosts from the same country code top-level domain in order for enhancing searches and recommending documents in a collection through the use of bookmarks shared among a community of users (see Pitkow et al., ¶ 2).

19. As per claim 9, Wilson et al. and Schuetze et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 24 and 8 above but fail to teach a method, wherein the predetermined number is 10. However, Pitkow et al. teaches a method, wherein the predetermined number is 10 (see Pitkow et al., ¶ 118). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wilson et al. and Schuetze et al. to a method, wherein the predetermined number is 10 in order to provide more directly relevant search results to that particular user (see Pitkow et al., ¶ 119).

20. As per claim 11, Wilson et al. and Schuetze et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 24 and 7 above but fail to teach a method of wherein said analyzing comprises determining whether a root or default document page for the at least one global host exists in one and only one ODP country section. However, Pitkow et al. teaches a method of wherein said analyzing comprises determining whether a root or default document page for the at least one global host exists in one and only one ODP country section. (see Pitkow et al., ¶ 118). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wilson et al. and Schuetze et al. to a

method of wherein said analyzing comprises determining whether a root or default document page for the at least one global host exists in one and only one ODP country section in order to provide more directly relevant search results to that particular user (see Pitkow et al., ¶ 119).

21. As per claim 13, Wilson et al. and Schuetze et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claim 24 above but fail to teach a method, further comprising, analyzing inlinks to the augmented set of hosts to assign a countrytag to a global host when all of the following three tests are true: there are more than a first predetermined percentage of unique inlinking hosts from the same country code top-level domain, a particular country code top-level domain accounts for more than a second predetermined percentage of the non-global unique inlinking hosts, and the number of inlinking hosts from a particular country is more than a predetermined threshold value. However, Pitkow et al. teachs a method, further comprising, analyzing inlinks to the augmented set of hosts to assign a countrytag to a global host when all of the following three tests are true (see Pitkow et al., ¶ 107): there are more than a first predetermined percentage of unique inlinking hosts from the same country code top-level domain, a particular country code top-level domain accounts for more than a second predetermined percentage of the non-global unique inlinking hosts, and the number of inlinking hosts from a particular country is more than a predetermined threshold value (see Pitkow et al., ¶ 55). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wilson et al. and Schuetze et al. to a method, further comprising, analyzing inlinks to the augmented set of hosts to assign a countrytag to a global host when all of the

following three tests are true: there are more than a first predetermined percentage of unique inlinking hosts from the same country code top-level domain, a particular country code top-level domain accounts for more than a second predetermined percentage of the non-global unique inlinking hosts, and the number of inlinking hosts from a particular country is more than a predetermined threshold value in order for enhancing searches and recommending documents in a collection through the use of bookmarks shared among a community of users (see Pitkow et al., ¶ 2).

22. As per claim 16, Wilson et al. and Schuetze et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 24 and 7 above but fail to teach a method, further comprising: summing unique inlinking hosts and outlinking hosts in the augmented set. However, Pitkow et al. teaches a method, further comprising: summing unique inlinking hosts and outlinking hosts in the augmented set (see Pitkow et al., ¶ 103). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wilson et al. and Schuetze et al. to a method, further comprising: summing unique inlinking hosts and outlinking hosts in the augmented set in order to provide a user with a "substitute" bookmark when a preferred document is unavailable (see Pitkow et al., ¶ 102).

23. Claims 10, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson et al., Schuetze et al., and Pitkow et al.

24. As per claim 10, Wilson et al., Schuetze et al., and Pitkow et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 24 and 8 above but Wilson et al. and Pitkow et al. fail to teach a method, wherein the predetermined percentage is 60%. However, Schuetze et al. teaches a method, wherein the predetermined percentage is 60% (see Schuetze et

al., col. 29, line 54-col. 30, line 7: wherein it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to change the predetermined percentage). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wilson et al. and Pitkow et al. to a method, wherein the predetermined percentage is 60% in order for quantitatively representing users in a user population, quantitatively determining similarity between users, clustering users according to those similarities, and visually representing clusters of users by analogy to clusters of documents (see Schuetze et al., abstract).

25. As per claim 14, Wilson et al., Schuetze et al., and Pitkow et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 24 and 13 above but Wilson et al. and Pitkow et al. fail to teach a method, wherein the first predetermined percentage is 40%. However, Schuetze et al. teaches a method, wherein the first predetermined percentage is 40% (see Schuetze et al., col. 29, line 54-col. 30, line 7: wherein it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to change the predetermined percentage). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wilson et al. and Pitkow et al. to a method, wherein the first predetermined percentage is 40% in order for quantitatively representing users in a user population, quantitatively determining similarity between users, clustering users according to those similarities, and visually representing clusters of users by analogy to clusters of documents (see Schuetze et al., abstract).

26. As per claim 15, Wilson et al., Schuetze et al., and Pitkow et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 24 and 13 above but Wilson et al. and Pitkow et al. fail

to teach a method, wherein the second predetermined percentage is 32%. However, Schuetze et al. teaches a method, wherein the second predetermined percentage is 32% (see Schuetze et al., col. 29, line 54-col. 30, line 7: wherein it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to change the predetermined percentage). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wilson et al. and Pitkow et al. to a method, wherein the second predetermined percentage is 32% in order for quantitatively representing users in a user population, quantitatively determining similarity between users, clustering users according to those similarities, and visually representing clusters of users by analogy to clusters of documents (see Schuetze et al., abstract).

27. Claims 12 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson et al., Schuetze et al., and Pitkow et al. as applied to claims 1 and 7 above, and further in view of Lakritz (6,526,426).

28. As per claim 12, Wilson et al. and Schuetze et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 24 and 7 above but fail to teach a method wherein said analyzing comprises determining whether the at least one global host is marked for manual countrytagging. However, Lakritz teaches a method wherein said analyzing comprises determining whether the at least one global host is marked for manual countrytagging (see Lakritz, col. 4, lines 27-38). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wilson et al. and Schuetze et al. to a method wherein said analyzing comprises determining whether the at least one global host is marked for

manual countrytagging in order to allow the most appropriate language of a requested document to be served to a Web browser (see Lakritz, col. 15, lines 59-61).

29. As per claim 19, Wilson et al. and Schuetze et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claim 24 above but fail to teach a method, further comprising: determining a countrytag for a web subsite. However, Lakritz teaches a method, further comprising determining a countrytag for a web subsite (see Lakritz, col. 6, lines 28-42). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wilson et al. and Schuetze et al. to a method, further comprising determining a countrytag for a web subsite in order to allow a multilingual web site to be built incrementally (see Lakritz, col. 6, lines 14-18).

30. Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson et al. and Pitkow et al.

31. As per claim 22, Wilson et al. teaches a method of determining whether a web site is of interest to users in a particular country (see Wilson et al., ¶ 39), comprising: assigning a countrytag to a global host of the web site when all of the following are true (see Wilson et al., ¶ 60-70). But fails to teach there are more unique inlinking hosts from country code top-level domains than from global domains, there are more than a predetermined number of unique inlinking hosts from country code top-level domains, and there are more than a predetermined percentage of unique inlinking hosts from a same country code top-level domain. However, Pitkow et al. teaches there are more unique inlinking hosts from country code top-level domains than from global domains (see Pitkow et al., ¶ 113), there are more than a predetermined number of unique

inlinking hosts from country code top-level domains (see Pitkow et al., ¶ 118), and there are more than a predetermined percentage of unique inlinking hosts from a same country code top-level domain (see Pitkow et al., ¶ 55). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wilson et al. to there are more unique inlinking hosts from country code top-level domains than from global domains, there are more than a predetermined number of unique inlinking hosts from country code top-level domains, and there are more than a predetermined percentage of unique inlinking hosts from a same country code top-level domain in order for enhancing searches and recommending documents in a collection through the use of bookmarks shared among a community of users (see Pitkow et al., ¶ 2).

32. As per claim 23, Wilson et al. teaches a method of determining whether a web site is of interest to users in a particular country (see Wilson et al., ¶ 39), comprising: assigning a countrytag to a global host of the web site when all of the following three tests are true (see Wilson et al., ¶ 60-70). But fails to teach there are more than a first predetermined percentage of unique inlinking hosts from a same country code top-level domain, a particular country code top-level domain accounts for more than a second predetermined percentage of non-global unique inlinking hosts, and the number of inlinking hosts from a particular country is more than a predetermined threshold value. However, Pitkow et al. teaches there are more than a first predetermined percentage of unique inlinking hosts from a same country code top-level domain, a particular country code top-level domain accounts for more than a second predetermined percentage of non-global unique inlinking hosts, and the number of inlinking hosts from a particular

country is more than a predetermined threshold value (see Pitkow et al., ¶ 55). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wilson et al. to there are more than a first predetermined percentage of unique inlinking hosts from a same country code top-level domain, a particular country code top-level domain accounts for more than a second predetermined percentage of non-global unique inlinking hosts, and the number of inlinking hosts from a particular country is more than a predetermined threshold value in order for enhancing searches and recommending documents in a collection through the use of bookmarks shared among a community of users (see Pitkow et al., ¶ 2).

33. Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson et al. and Schuetze et al. as applied to claims 24 and 7 above, and further in view of Page (6,285,999).

34. As per claim 17, Wilson et al. and Schuetze et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 24 and 7 above but fail to teach a method, further comprising: adding extra points to a voting value for a country when a name of a non-global host suggests that country. However, Page teaches a method, further comprising: adding extra points to a voting value for a country when a name of a non-global host suggests that country (see Page, col. 9, lines 15-22). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wilson et al. and Schuetze et al. to a method, further comprising: adding extra points to a voting value for a country when a name of a non-global host suggests that country in order to provide a document ranking method

that is scalable and can be applied to extremely large databases such as the world wide web (see Page, col. 2, lines 39-50).

35. As per claim 18, Wilson et al. and Schuetze et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 24 and 7 above but fail to teach a method, further comprising: adding extra points to a voting value for a country when an IP address of the host is in that country. However, Page teaches a method, further comprising: adding extra points to a voting value for a country when an IP address of the host is in that country (see Page, col. 9, lines 15-22). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wilson et al. and Schuetze et al. to a method, further comprising: adding extra points to a voting value for a country when an IP address of the host is in that country in order to provide a document ranking method that is scalable and can be applied to extremely large databases such as the world wide web (see Page, col. 2, lines 39-50).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ranodhi Serrao whose telephone number is (571) 272-7967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30pm, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER